



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,786	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.321-US-01	9206
55895	7590	11/26/2007		
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			EXAMINER ORR, HENRY W	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,786

Applicant(s)

GARCIA ET AL.

Examiner

Henry Orr

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 10/5/2007.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

4. In Applicant's response dated 10/5/2007, applicant has amended the following:

a) Claims 1, 6 and 11

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 7/5/2007 are withdrawn:

a) Objection to claims 1-15

b) Objection to Drawings

Claim Objections

5. The claims are objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,339,439 B1, in view of Workman et al. (hereinafter "Workman"), U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0236754.

Claim 1:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheet Sets and Sheets, wherein each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Subsets of the Sheets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another*

Art Unit: 2176

representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program" (abstract). **(claim 3; i.e., such that the Sheet Set Manager displays a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Set that shows the Subsets of the Sheets Sets contained therein as well as the Subsets of the Sheet Sets that show the Sheets contained therein;)** Examiner considers the hierarchical relationship amongst the graphical icons that represents drawing sheets to be a display of a logical structure for sheet sets, subsets, and sheets. Bonney's Figure 2 illustrates the hierarchical logical structure displayed on a computer (see Figure 2; ref. #121).

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing a Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches an interface for publishing Sheets (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 1; i.e., and the Sheet Set Manager publishes the Sheet Sets, the Subsets of the Sheet Sets and the Sheets.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing Sheets as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Claim 2:

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing a selection of Sheets within the Sheet Set using a single operation.

However, Workman teaches a single operation of a click that is used to publish target drawings (see par. 51). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager publishes a selection of the Sheets within the Sheet Set using a single operation.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface capable of receiving a single click operation as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Claim 5:

Bonney teaches a plot stamp with each Sheet (see par 22).

Bonney fails to expressly teach including a plot stamp with each Sheet of the published Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches including a plot stamp with each published Sheet (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 5; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager includes a plot stamp with each of the Sheets of the published Sheet Set.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set with a plot stamp as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly allowing designers to review and identify the drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 4-5, par. 51).

Claims 6, 7 and 10:

Claims 6, 7 and 10 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

Claims 11, 12, and 15:

Claims 11, 12, and 15 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

8. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Workman as cited above, and in further view of Haddad, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111928 A1.

Claim 3:

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches applying publishing override properties for the Sheets.

However, Haddad teaches "Fig. 9C illustrates a graphical user interface screen for editing print settings for a selected document set etc...Parameters related to the print media are entered by the user in the sheet definitions fields 932" (see p. 7 par. 91).

(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the

Sheets.) Examiner considers the print settings entered by the user for a printing work order to override any default publishing printing properties at a reprographic company that receive the printing work order for the drawing sheets. **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for print settings as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of properly applying a print specification to a drawing document in an efficient manner (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 4-5).

Claim 4:

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches allowing different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.

However, Haddad teaches *"one or more repro companies can be selected to produce the print work order"* (see p. 7-8 par. 93). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.)** Examiner considers the repro companies to be capable of printing the applicable documents or files (see Haddard; p. 4 par. 51). Therefore, the different repro companies listed in the graphical interface of Haddard's Figure 11 have

their own individual output device, which allows a user to send print work orders associated with drawing sheets to the different repro companies having their own printing output device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for repro companies as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of efficiently producing and distributing printed documents (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 9-11).

Claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3 and 4 above.

Claims 13 and 14:

Claims 13 and 14 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 13 and 14 above.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Prior Art Rejections

10. In respect to independent claims 1, 6 and 13, Applicant argues Bonney does not describe a Sheet Set Manager. Applicant asserts that there is no recognition in Bonney of the concept of Sheet Sets or Subsets of Sheets Sets as those terms are defined in Applicants' claims and specification, (see Response page 7)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bonny teaches computer aided design application program ("Sheet Set Manager") that creates and manages drawings (abstract, col. 1 lines 17-25). Each drawing may illustrate a certain detail of a model (see col. 1 lines 32-33). The details of the model may include alternative views and section views (see col. 1 lines 26-28). In other words, the drawings of a particular model anticipates a **Sheet Set** of a particular model, section views of the model drawings anticipate **Subsets of the Sheet Sets**, and the drawings which illustrate the details of the model anticipate the **Sheets**. Therefore, a designer uses the CAD application program to manage Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheets, and Sheets as recited in the independent claims.

Bonney teaches Figure 2 to be one embodiment of a computer system executing a CAD application program that generates objects of the drawing sheets of a design with a hierarchical relationship. Bonney further teaches that a drawing sheet may illustrate a certain detail of a model (see col. 1 lines 32-33). The details of the model may include alternative views and section views (see col. 1 lines 26-28).

In other words, the drawings of a particular model anticipates a **Sheet Set** of a particular model, section views of the model drawings anticipate **Subsets of the Sheet Sets**, and the drawings which illustrate the details of the model anticipate the **Sheets**.

Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Bonney reference before him at the time the invention was made, to include with the drawing sheets ("**Sheets**") as shown in Figure 2, drawings sheets of a particular model ("**Sheet Set**"), and section views of the model drawings ("**Subsets of the Sheet Sets**") as taught by Bonney to illustrate the hierarchical relationship between Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheet Sets, and Sheets.

11. Applicant argues Workman does not describe publishing a Sheet Set, the Subsets of the Sheet Sets and the Sheets.(see Response page 8)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As explained above, Bonney does teach the hierarchical relationship between Sheets, Subsets of Sheet Sets, and Sheets.

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing a Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches an interface for publishing Sheets (see par. 5, par. 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing Sheets ("Sheets, Subsets of Sheet Sets, and Sheets") as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

12. Applicant arguments with respect to dependent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13 and 14 are substantially encompassed in the arguments for independent claims 1,6 and 11 above, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above. (see Response page 8)

Conclusion

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

11/14/2007
HO

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100